



2155

#13

LDT

2-11-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:	Uri Elzur	§	Art Unit:	2155
		§		
Serial No.:	09/364,085	§		
		§	Examiner:	Wendy Lee
Filed:	July 30, 1999	§		
		§		
Title:	Associating a Packet With a Flow	§	Docket No.	ITL.0149US (P6585)
		§		

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED

FEB 10 2003

Technology Center 2100

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 12, 2002

Dear Sir:

In an Office Action mailed on December 12, 2002, claims 1, 3-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackowski in view of Law.

In the § 103 rejections of independent claims 1 and 14, the Examiner combines teachings from both Law and Jackowski. In particular, the Examiner combines Law's teaching of storing a table in a depot to track TCP sessions associated with different servers 50. It is noted that Law neither teaches nor suggests tracking actual packets, but rather, Law is directed to a larger granularity, i.e., tracking sessions with particular servers. Thus, Law does not teach or even suggest storing a table that is associated with different packet flows.

In short, the Examiner fails to provide any support for a suggestion or motivation to modify Jackowski so that the table of Jackowski is stored in a memory of a peripheral. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art to support the combination or motivation. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Furthermore, the Examiner must support the alleged suggestion or motivation to combine or modify references with specific citations to a prior art reference. *Ex parte Gambogi*, 62 USPQ2d 1209, 1212 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 2001); *In re Rijckaert*, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); M.P.E.P. § 2143. The

Date of Deposit: January 30, 2003

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Debra Cutrona
Debra Cutrona

Examiner fails to specifically show support for the alleged suggestion or motivation for the combination of Jackowski and Law; and the Examiner fails to show any support for the modification of Jackowski's disclosure so that Jackowski's table is stored in a memory of a peripheral. Rather, the Examiner merely concludes such suggestion or motivation exists without providing any support for this conclusion.


Thus, for at least the reason that the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for either independent claim 1 or independent claim 14, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of these claims is requested. Claims 3-8, 15 and 17-19 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0149US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2003



Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE